DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 145 540 EA 010 006

TITLE	The School Principal. A Report Pursuant to Resolution Chapter 102 of 1977 (ACR 35). Report 77-26.
INSTITUTION	California State Legislature, Sacramento. Office of the Legislative Analyst.
PUB DATE	Oct 77
NOTE	61p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$3.50 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Administrator Characteristics; *Administrator Education; *Administrator Evaluation; *Administrator Role; *Administrator Selection; Certification; Elementary Secondary Education; Inservice Education; Literature Reviews; *Principals; Professional Training; State Legislation; *Statistical Data
IDENTIFIERS	*California

ABSTRACT

This study begins with a review of research regarding the effectiveness and role of the school principal in improving student performance, in school climate, and in reform. Section 2 presents data regarding the age, sex, ethnicity, average yearly salary, and turnover of California school principals. The third section provides information on preservice principal training, focusing on credentialing requirements, evaluation of current credentialing programs, and research on the adequacy of preservice training. Section 4 deals with the selection and evaluation of principals, and section 5 examines inservice training programs for principals, including participation by the state department of education and the state board. The final part of this report contains recommendations and long-range approaches to problems examined in the first five sections. This paper was written as a report to the California legislature. (Author/DS)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED145540

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

THE SCHOOL PRINCIPAL

A REPORT PURSUANT TO RESOLUTION CHAPTER 102 OF 1977 (ACR 35)

OCTOBER, 1977

LEGISLATIVE ANALYST

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

925 L STREET, SUITE 650

SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95814

Permission to reproduce this document is printed on the verso of the cover.

77-26

EA 010 006

PRINTING OF THIS REPORT HAS BEEN LIMITED PRIMARILY TO ANTICIPATED LEGISLATIVE NEEDS. PERMISSION IS GRANTED TO REPRODUCE IT FOR OTHER PURPOSES AS DESIRED.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
INTRODUCTION		1
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS		3
SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS		7
I.	THE ROLE OF PRINCIPALS IN SCHOOLS	9
	A. The Role of Principals in Improving Student Performance	9
	B. The Role of Principals and School Climate	13
	C. The Role of Principals in Innovation and Reform	14
	D. Changes in the Role of the School Principal	16
II.	STATISTICS REGARDING PRINCIPALS	20
	A. Age	20
	B. Sex	21
	C. Ethnicity	24
	D. Salary	25
	E. Turnover	26
III.	THE PRE-SERVICE TRAINING AND CREDENTIALING OF PRINCIPALS	28
	A. Research on the Adequacy of Pre-Service Training	28
	B. Current Training and Credentialing Requirements	30
	C. Guidelines for Administrative Services Credential Preparation Programs	31
	D. Number of Institutions Offering Programs and Number of Credentials Issued	32
	E. Review and Evaluation of Current Programs	35

Page

IV. SELECTION AND EVALUATION OF PRINCIPALS 37

A. Selection of Principals. 37

B. Research on the Selection of Principals. 38

C. Evaluation of Principals 40

D. Research on the Evaluation of Principals 41

V. IN-SERVICE TRAINING PROGRAMS FOR PRINCIPALS. 44

A. Need for Programs. 44

B. Current In-Service Training Opportunities. 44

C. Department of Education and State Board Participation. . . 50

D. Research Concerning In-Service Program Effectiveness . . . 51

VI. UNFINISHED TASKS 53

APPENDIX: PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCY REQUIREMENTS FOR THE ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES CREDENTIAL PREPARATION PROGRAMS 55

INTRODUCTION

ACR 35 (Resolution, Chapter 102, enrolled September 13, 1977) provided that:

(a) the Office of the Legislative Analyst review and analyze "current research regarding the training, selection, credentialing, evaluation, and continuing professional development of school principals and report its findings to the Legislature by October 1, 1977," and

(b) such report "include data regarding principal age, sex and ethnicity, average yearly salary and turnover and proposed changes in the current system including, but not limited to, administrative training, credentialing, selection, evaluation, and continuing education."

This study begins with a review of research regarding the effectiveness and role of school principals. The second section presents data regarding age, sex, ethnicity, average yearly salary and turnover. Section three provides information relative to pre-service training. Selection and evaluation processes are detailed in the fourth section, followed by information regarding in-service training opportunities in the fifth section. Finally, the sixth section details longer-range approaches to these problems.

In conducting this study, we examined:

(a) studies of the effectiveness of principals;

(b) statistical data;

(c) research regarding changing principal roles;

(d) data concerning the pre-service training and credentialing of school administrators; and

(e) the selection and evaluation procedures for principals as well as their in-service training opportunities.

This study involved a review of the literature on the role of principals and their needs for staff development; structured telephone interviews with a stratified random sample of 30 California school principals; visits to in-service training programs; and over 100 interviews and conversations with school district personnel, university experts in the training of school administrators, school board members, attorneys, legislators and their staff members, Department of Education personnel, staff members of the Commission for Teacher Preparation and Licensing, professionals employed by the Association of California School Administrators, personnel from the California Commission on the Status of Women, members of the State Title IX Task Force, members of the State Board of Education, and other experts. Certain statistical data were collected specifically for this study by the Association of California School Administrators.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

I. The Role of Principals in Schools

1. Principal leadership has, at least in some cases, been shown to have an effect on the levels of student performance. Some studies show that students score higher in schools where principals share decisionmaking while maintaining an active role in school affairs. (pp. 12)

2. Most of the variation in student performance levels is statistically related to measures of student background. This suggests that the effectiveness of the school leader (or other school variables) will have only a supplementary effect on the levels of student performance. (pp. 12)

3. Some studies have shown a relationship between principal styles and teacher attitudes and behavior. Principals who were concerned about the quality of education were found to have teachers who were more oriented toward their professional lives and who had higher morale. Principals who were supportive and teacher-oriented had staffs who were more satisfied with their jobs. (pp. 14)

4. The support of school principals is important to accomplish school reform. Often, it is they who organize schools around new ideas and who stimulate new ways of doing things. (pp. 16)

5. A number of forces are changing the role of the school site executive. As a result of these forces, many principals feel overwhelmed. They often feel also that their authority has diminished and they sometimes feel they have been placed in impossible positions. (pp. 19)

II. Statistics Regarding Principals

1. The percentage of principals who are women has declined from 15 percent in 1970-71 to 11.4 percent in 1975-76. (pp. 23)

2. The decline in the number of women principals does not stem from an unavailability of candidates (a) who are credentialed or (b) who are employed in lower level administrative positions. (pp. 24)

3. A substantial increase in the percentage of principals who are minority group members took place between 1967 and 1973. The percentage of principals who are minority group members was approximately the same as the percentage who were teachers in 1973. More recent data will be collected this fall pursuant to Chapter 896, Statutes of 1977 (AB 65). (pp. 25)

4. Limited available data suggest that there may be substantial turnover among principals. Inasmuch as adequate turnover data is not currently available, and because stability in the principalship may be important (see Section I), data should be collected and analyzed. (pp. 27)

III. Pre-Service Training and Credentialing of Principals

1. All school administrators are licensed by a single credential. (pp. 32)

2. Training programs for school administrators are broad-scoped. It would be difficult to make requirements more precise because they are designed for persons who are to serve in supervisory positions not only at the school site but in the district office. (pp. 32)

3. Since persons have been able to obtain administrative services credentials via the examination process, a substantial shift has taken place

in the means by which administrators are licensed. In 1976-77, two-thirds of all administrators were licensed on the basis of a test. (This proportion may decline in the future because of a recent change in the qualifying score.) (pp. 34)

4. The state is currently licensing more school administrators than are needed. (pp. 34)

5. The Commission for Teacher Preparation and Licensing has been unable to provide us with accurate data regarding the basis upon which administrators services credentials are issued. (pp. 34)

6. Legislation explicitly requires that the Commission for Teacher Preparation and Licensing monitor and evaluate the quality of teacher preparation programs. No mandate is stipulated regarding the evaluation of administrative services or other support services credentialing programs. (pp.36)

7. The overall quality of administrator preparation programs has not been assessed at the state level since the Ryan Act was implemented. (pp. 36)

IV. Selection and Evaluation of Principals

1. Administrative selection procedures used by school districts are not always based upon written guidelines. Similarly, transfer and promotion procedures for administrators may not be systematic. (pp.38)

2. No systematic, reliable procedure has been developed for use in all situations for selecting principals. However, because of the variation in school needs, a uniform approach may be inappropriate. (pp. 39)

3. Regular principal evaluations based on written criteria are required in the Stull Act. These evaluations are conducted by district central office personnel. (pp. 41)

V. In-Service Training Programs

1. Opportunities currently exist for principals to acquire needed in-service training through (a) categorical programs, (b) universities, which, in addition to general courses, provide in-service opportunities designed specifically for practicing administrators; (c) professional associations; (d) the Professional Development and Program Improvement Centers, which provide programs in some districts for school personnel in elementary schools with selected categorical programs; and (e) a number of locally funded efforts. Additional funds for in-service opportunities will be available through AB 551 and the federal teacher center program. (pp. 49-50)

2. The Professional Development and Program Improvement Centers (PDPICs) are restricted by statute to elementary schools having certain categorical programs. Inasmuch as the regulations which apply to most of these programs require that staff development components be included in the programs for all participants (including principals), restricting PDPIC's to elementary schools is no longer necessary. By eliminating this restriction, funds could be redirected to secondary schools. (pp. 50)

3. Although evidence exists that some programs are successful in achieving desired outcomes, evaluative information is inadequate to describe (a) the settings in which successful programs are likely to result or (b) optimal formats for effective programs. (pp. 52)

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

II. Statistics Regarding Principals

1. We recommend that the Department of Education investigate the reasons behind the modest representation of women in principalships and report its findings and recommendations to the Legislature by June 1, 1978. (pp. 24)

2. We recommend that the Department of Education collect and report to the Legislature (on a one-time basis) statistics regarding turnover rates for public school administrators, together with reasons for turnover. (pp. 27)

III. Pre-Service Training and Credentialing of Principals

1. We recommend that the Commission for Teacher Preparation and Licensing include in its annual report breakdowns regarding the number of credentials granted according to the requirements mandated by law. (pp. 34)

2. We recommend that Section 44225 of the Education Code be amended to require that the Commission for Teacher Preparation and Licensing monitor and evaluate the results of its action as it relates to the performance of all persons licensed by it. (pp. 36)

3. We recommend that the Commission for Teacher Preparation and Licensing develop a plan to evaluate administrative services credential programs which (a) is designed to compare the quality of the performance of persons who have completed training programs licensed under (i) the regular preparation program, (ii) the internship, and (iii) the test; and (b) enables comparisons to be made between programs at different institutions. (pp. 36)

V. In-Service Training Programs.

1. We recomend legislation to extend the Professional Development and Program Improvement Centers to secondary schools. (pp. 50)

I. THE ROLE OF PRINCIPALS IN SCHOOLS

Our review of studies on the effectiveness of principals has identified sources which find that principals have an impact on (a) student performance; (b) school climate; and (c) innovation. These findings should be tested in other settings before the findings reported can be considered to be definitive.

A. THE ROLE OF PRINCIPALS IN IMPROVING STUDENT PERFORMANCE

Principal leadership has, at least in some cases, been shown to have an effect on student performance.

Our review of studies regarding the relationship of principal characteristics and student performance included the following:

1. The School Effectiveness Study, funded by the California Legislature (Chapter 1094, Statutes of 1973), investigated factors which affected the level of student performance (beyond usual family background factors). The report included several findings regarding principals. Higher-achieving schools were staffed with principals having more experience at those schools. These principals generally reported higher levels of job satisfaction. Further, teachers at higher-achieving schools reported that their principals (a) gave them more influence over curriculum decisions and (b) asked for advice regarding hiring of teachers and aides. The teachers at higher-performing schools rated their principals higher on "general performance standards."[1]

---

1. California State Department of Education, Office of Program Evaluation and Research, School Effectiveness Study: The First Year (Sacramento: The Department, 1977), p. 22.

2. The New York State Department of Education investigated two schools serving low socioeconomic status students, one with relatively high achievement scores and one with relatively low achievement scores. One of the differences between the two schools was judged to be the better quality of principal leadership in the higher achieving school.[1]

3. In another study of four inner-city schools which had high performance levels in reading, strong administrative leadership was a common trait. In each case, the principal (or in one case, the district superintendent) was not only a strong leader but had specifically been involved as leader in the reading program.[2]

4. Recently the Department of Education completed the first part of a special investigation into the reasons associated with long-term changes in third grade reading achievement for low socioeconomic level schools having Early Childhood Education programs. The study found that quality of leadership in managing (or not managing) change, both at the school and district level, was one of the factors associated with student performance. In several of the schools with increasing performance levels, the building principal exerted a positive leadership role. In two schools with declining performance levels, principals whose style was authoritarian were reported to have created an "atmosphere of repression."[3]

---

1. State of New York, Office of Education Performance Review, School Factors Influencing Reading Achievement: A Case Study of Two Inner City Schools. (New York: Author, 1974), pp. 11-13.

2. George Weber, Inner-City Children Can Be Taught to Read: Four Successful Schools. Council for Basic Education, Occasional Papers #18, October, 1971. Quoted in Rita Mize, The Effects of Principal Behavior Upon Teacher Performance in High and Low Achieving Schools. Ph.D. Diss. University of California, Berkeley, forthcoming, Chapter I.

3. California State Department of Education, Interim Report on the Special Study of Selected ECE Schools with Increasing and Decreasing Reading Scores (Sacramento: The Department, 1977), pp. 2, 17 and 18.

Research regarding the role of principals is ongoing and information from at least three studies will be available soon.[1]

It is important to note that even particularly effective school practices cannot overcome the effects of student and community background characteristics. Taken together, such characteristics can explain approximately three-fourths of the total between-school variation in student achievement.[2,3]

As an indication of the importance of student background, a RAND Corporation study of effective strategies for teaching reading in Los Angeles minority schools reported that an "average" student in those schools studied scored in the 30th percentile. If this hypothetical student had been exposed to all of the effective practices identified, the performance level would have risen to the 41st percentile. While this hypothetical gain is important, the study shows that even particularly effective practices do not systematically overcome the effects of student

1. Researchers at the RAND Corporation, continuing their research on federal projects and educational change, are identifying characteristics of principals which are related to school success. See also, Rita M. Mize, The Effects of Principal Behavior Upon Teacher Performance in High and Low-Achieving Schools, op. cit. The second part of the Interim Report on the Special Study of Selected ECE Schools . . . will be available from the Department of Education in the near future. Our office is aware of other studies still in the preliminary phases.

2. California State Department of Education, Office of Program Evaluation and Research, California State Testing Program, 1971-72: Technical Supplement (Sacramento, The Department, 1973 and 1974 respectively).

3. California State Department of Education, Office of Program Evaluation and Research, School Effectiveness Study: The First Year, op. cit., p. 1.

background factors.[1] Thus, research on the effectiveness of school related variables provides information regarding inputs which have only a marginal effect on student performance.[2]

Conclusions

1. Principal leadership has, at least in some cases, been shown to have an effect on the levels of student performance. Some studies show that students score higher in schools where principals share decisionmaking while maintaining an active role in school affairs.

2. Most of the variation in student performance levels is statistically related to measures of student background. This suggests that the effectiveness of the school leader (or other school variables) will have only a supplementary effect on the levels of student performance.

1. David Armor, et. al., Analysis of the School Preferred Reading Program in Selected Los Angeles Minority Schools (Santa Monica: The RAND Corporation, 1976), p. 58. Similar effects are reported in the School Effectiveness Study, op. cit., and in Martin Carnoy, "Is Compensatory Education Possible?" in M. Carnoy, Schooling in a Corporate Society, Second Edition (New York: David McKay, 1975), pp. 229-244.

2. Among factors which have been shown in one or more studies to be related to student performance levels are:
(1) time spent teaching reading (up to 17 percent of the variance). (Barak Rosenshine, "Classroom Instruction", in The Psychology of Teaching Methods, the 1976 Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education (Chicago, University of Chicago, 1976), pp. 342-343);
(2) teacher verbal ability (up to 3 percent of variance). (James S. Coleman, Equality of Educational Opportunity (Washington, D.C.: USGPO, 1965), pp. 130-136).
(3) principal leadership qualities (up to 3 percent of variance). (School Effectiveness Study: The First Year, op. cit., Table A-7.)

B. THE ROLE OF PRINCIPALS AND SCHOOL CLIMATE

Principal leadership styles have been statistically related to some measures of school climate such as teacher morale and professional activity.

1. Part of the National Principal Study in 1960-61 measured the relationship between "Executive Professional Leadership" in elementary schools and (a) teacher morale, and (b) teacher professional performance. Executive Professional Leadership was defined as "the efforts of an executive of a professionally staffed organization to conform to a definition of his role that stresses his obligation to improve the quality of staff performance." The study reported a positive relationship between teacher morale and performance and the leadership of the principal.[1]

2. Another study of principal leadership found, among other things, that:

(a) principals who organized schools around new ideas, initiated meetings with teachers, and functioned as catalysts in promoting changes had teachers who were more active professionally;

(b) principals displaying a high degree of supportive, friendly behavior had teachers in their schools with high morale; and

(c) less authoritarian principals had somewhat more professionally active teachers.[2]

1. Neal Gross and Robert E. Herriott, Staff Leadership in Public Schools: A Sociological Inquiry. (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1965). Inasmuch as this study was done over 15 years ago, the findings may not be applicable today.

2. Ann Lieberman, The Effects of Principal Leadership on Teacher Morale, Professionalism and Style in the Classroom. Ed.D Dissertation, UCLA, School of Education, 1969. This study is one stemming from the League of Cooperating School project funded by the Charles F. Kettering foundation (see Mary M. Bentzen, below).

3. A recent study in Southern California schools identified a number of areas where principal behavior was significantly related to teacher behavior and morale. Principals who were teacher-oriented had schools which teachers felt were more open and satisfying places to work.[1]

Conclusion

Some studies have shown a relationship between principal styles and teacher attitudes and behavior. Principals who were concerned about the quality of education were found to have teachers who were more oriented toward their professional lives and who had higher morale. Principals who were supportive and teacher-oriented had staffs who were more satisfied with their jobs.

C. THE ROLE OF PRINCIPALS IN INNOVATION AND REFORM

Principal behavior can play a central part in the successful adoption of innovations. The support of administrators appears to be a necessary ingredient in implementing new programs. Our review identified several studies which point to the need for the involvement and support of principals in the change process.

1. A major study of innovation was conducted in a group of Los Angeles area schools between 1966 and 1972. The purpose of the study was to discover how schools coped with pressures to change. One of its findings

1. Theodore E. Vick, "Climate Improvement in Elementary Schools", Thrust, Vol. 5, No. 4 (March 1976), pp. 23-24. See also, Theodore Earl Vick, A Study of the Relationship Between the Principal's Management Style and School Climate, Ph.D. Dissertation, University of California, Santa Barbara, 1975.

was that in high-change schools, principals took on a new role - that of the "principal-as-monitor" - rather than as an authoritarian leader.[1]

2. The RAND Corporation has been conducting a study of four federal programs to identify factors associated with promoting educational change in schools. After the first year of the study, RAND reported that the major factors associated with successful implementation of educational reform involved the organizational climate, the level of motivation among participants, and the scope of change involved. Thus, success was related primarily to internal factors rather than outside variables. RAND reported that "a receptive institution is a necessary but not sufficient condition for effective implementation."[2] With respect to administrative staff, strong administrative support from all levels (not just principals) appeared to be an essential component of successful implementation.[3]

3. A similar conclusion was reported in a study of schools in the Los Angeles Unified School District. There the researchers stated that no uniform district policy for school reform would work and that

---

1. Mary M. Bentzen, et. al., Changing Schools: The Magic Feather Principle, (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1975), pp. 65-66.

2. Paul Berman and Milbrey Wallin McLaughlin, Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change, Vol. IV: The Findings in Review (Santa Monica: RAND, 1975), p. x. The study also found that it was more difficult to implement change in high school or junior high school projects than in elementary projects. (Peter W. Greenwood, et. al., Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change, Vol. III: The Process of Change (Santa Monica: RAND, 1975), p. 65.

3. Peter W. Greenwood, et. al., Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change, Vol. III: The Process of Change (Santa Monica: RAND, 1975), p. 66.

each school's staff needed to develop their own programs.[1] In this setting, the support of the principal is critical.

Conclusion

The support of school principals is important to accomplish school reform. Often, it is they who organize schools around new ideas and who stimulate new ways of doing things.

D. CHANGES IN THE ROLE OF THE SCHOOL PRINCIPAL

Traditionally, the role of the principal has included such activities as (a) dealing with parents, (b) disciplining students, (c) hiring, assigning and evaluating staff, (d) overseeing student class assignment, (e) overseeing building maintenance and cafeteria management, (f) ordering school supplies, and (g) providing such services and support as required by the district central office.

More recently, schools have become a focal point for changing society. Accordingly, important additional demands have been made on schools, and indirectly, on the principals who run them. Among these demands are the following:

1. Categorical Programs. A variety of special programs have been instituted at the state and federal level, particularly for educating disadvantaged children.[2] The principalship is dramatically more complicated

1. David Armor, et. al., Analysis of the School Preferred Reading Program in Selected Los Angeles Minority Schools (Santa Monica: RAND 1976), pp. 39-40. This study also reported "substantial" variation in classroom outcomes, suggesting that teachers themselves contribute to measures of student learn

2. The number of schools having categorical programs has increased dramatically since 1965 when the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) was enacted. Last year, approximately half of California's principals had categorical programs in their schools.

at schools which receive these special-purpose funds.[1] Categorical programs can place added stress on staff relationships.[2]

2. Staff Evaluation. Chapter 361, Statutes of 1961 (also known as the Stull Act) requires the governing board of each school district to conduct a written assessment of the performance of all certificated employees including principals.[3] Accountability through the Stull Act increases administrative responsibilities especially when contractual relationships deriving from collective bargaining complicate the principal's role in staff evaluation.

3. Rights of Handicapped Children. Federal law 94-142, known as the Education for All Handicapped Children Act, requires school districts to assume responsibility for educating all children in their districts. Under the act, every handicapped child has the right to (a) a "free and appropriate public education", (b) placement in the least restrictive environment, (c) a learning program especially designed to meet his or her needs, (d) an annual review of program placement, and (e) administrative or judicial review of program placement.

California's Master Plan for Special Education, designed partly to meet the requirements of PL 94-142, also mandates new staff roles and new procedures for teaching handicapped children.

Programmatic and procedural demands related to these statutes will complicate the principal's role.

---

1. See, for example, Wilson C. Riles, "ECE in California Passes Its First Tests, Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. 57, No. 1 (Sept. 1975), p. 5.

2. Terrance A. Deal, et. al., The Early Childhood Education Program: An Assessment of Its Impact and Implementation (Stanford: SCRDT, 1977), pp. 16, 31.

3. Education Code, Sections 44660 ff. and 44932 ff.

4. Collective Bargaining. Chapter 961, Statutes of 1975 (SB 160) provides California's schools with a collective bargaining law. Under this statute, principals are typically designated as management employees, which means that (a) they cannot engage in bargaining, and (b) they will need to manage the contracts which are signed. Contract management places principals more formally in the position of being management representatives.[1]

5. Student Rights. Recent U.S. Supreme Court cases[2] require that certain 14th amendment rights be extended to students. In 1977, the Legislature enacted Chapter 965 (AB 530-Hart), to bring California into conformity with these decisions. Effective January,1, 1978, students will normally have access to due process hearings in disciplinary situations when suspensions are given by principals. Furthermore, notice that parents or guardians have a right to request a hearing must be provided. No student may be suspended for more than 20 days in one year. The added procedural safeguards are expected to require substantial increased time and effort on the part of school administrators.[3]

Conclusion

A number of forces are changing the role of the school site executive. As a result of these forces, many principals feel overwhelmed. They often

---

1. Unless they are placed in the category of supervisory employees as defined in this law.

2. Goss v. Lopez (95 S. Ct. 729) and Wood v. Strickland (420 U.S. 308).

3. See Ronald J. Anson, "The Educator's Response to Goss and Wood" and Richard W. MacFeeley, "The Nuts and Bolts of Procedural Due Process", Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. 57, No. 1 (Sept. 1975), pp. 16-19 and p. 26 respectively.

feel also that their authority has diminished[1] and they sometimes feel they have been placed in impossible positions.[2]

1. Jack Preble, Yesterday the Rabbi Explained Why (Fullerton, CA: California State University). p. 12.

2. Memo, Dr. William L. Cunningham, Association of California School Administrators, no date. This memo is a list of "No Win Ballgames" for school administrators.

II. STATISTICS REGARDING PRINCIPALS

This section presents basic descriptive statistics regarding the (a) age, (b) sex, (c) ethnicity, (d) average yearly salary, and (e) turnover rates for school principals in California.

A. AGE

Data regarding the ages of school administrators (including principals) were collected by the Association of California School Administrators (ACSA). A summary is presented in Table 1.

Table 1
Age of School Site Administrators[a]

	Percent in Each Range			
Age Range	Elementary	Intermediate/ Junior High	High School	Total
20-29	0%	0%	0%	0%
30-39	18	26	21	21
40-49	44	39	47	44
over 49	38	35	32	35
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%

a. Based on 1,107 responses to a member survey conducted by the Association of California School Administrators, Burlingame, California, May 1977.

Caution should be exercised in interpreting this data because only 1,107 of the 11,500 school administrators who are ACSA members responded to the survey. These data suggest that a substantial portion of school si › administrators are over 49. Companion data provided by ACSA shows that a larger percentage (44 percent) of central office personnel are over 49.

B. SEX

Whereas the teaching population used to be overwhelmingly female, substantial numbers of men have entered the profession in the last quarter century. Fifty years ago, over half of school principals in the US were women.[1] By 1970-71, nationally, only 15 percent of school principals were women.[2]

Similar patterns exist in California. In 1970-71, while women held 67 percent of the public elementary and secondary school teaching positions, they occupied only 15 percent of the principalships, and most of these were at the elementary level.[3] By 1973-74, this percentage had declined to 13.6 percent[4] and by 1975-76 to 11.4 percent.[5]

Women occupy a greater percentage of lower administrative positions such as assistant principals, deans, coordinators, and supervisors. For

1. David Coursen, "Women and Minorities in Administration", School Leadership Digest Series, No. 11. (Arlington: National Assn. of Elementary School Principals, 1975).

2. National Education Association - Research Division, Professional Women in Public Schools (Washington, D.C.: The Association, 1972). Quoted in Catherine Dillon and Terry N. Saario, "Women in Public Education: Sexual Discrimination in Promotions", Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. 55, No. 2 (October 1973), p. 120.

3. Advisory Commission on the Status of Women, California Women (State of California, Documents Section, 1971), pp. 42 and 67.

4. State Department of Education, Racial and Ethnic Distribution of Pupils and Staff in California Public Schools, Fall 1973. (Sacramento: The Department, 1974).

5. Bureau of School Apportionments and Reports, California State Department of Education, Salaries of Certificated Employees in California Public Schools, 1975-76 (Sacramento: The Department, 1976), pp. 12-13.

example, 37 percent of the deans were reported to be women in 1973-74. In all, the Department of Education estimated that women held 40 percent of over 1,100 miscellaneous administrative and supervisory positions in that year.[1]

A smaller percentage of women are employed at upper levels of administration[2] and throughout the university community in departments of educational administration.[3,4]

An interesting aspect of this situation is that in some ways women would seem to be better qualified candidates for the principalship. They score higher on standardized tests,[5,6] they have more experience,[7,8]

1. Bureau of School Apportionments and Reports, California State Department of Education, Report of Women in Public Elementary and Secondary Education in California, 1973-74 (Sacramento: The Department, no date). During the same period, the percentage of teachers who are women declined to 62.1 percent.

2. Ibid. Less than 1 percent of superintendents were women and less than 3 percent of major central office personnel, according to this survey.

3. Carol Kehr Tittle, et. al., "Women in Educational Research: Their Status from Student to Employee", Educational Researcher, Vol. 4, No. 9, (Oct. 1975) pp. 15-21.

4. California Institute for Studies in Equality, "Equality in Education: How Do Our Schools Line Up?" Monitor, Vol. 3, No. 2, (March/April 1977), p. 9. Data is from an American Association of University Professors survey.

5. Jack Preble, Yesterday the Rabbi Explained Why (Fullerton, CA: California State University, Fullerton, N.d.), p. 13.

6. Commission for Teacher Preparation and Licensing, Statistics for National Teacher Examinations, 1975-76.

7. Preble, op. cit.

8. Suzanne S. Taylor, "Educational Leadership: A Male Domain?" Phi Delta Kappan, Vol, 55, No. 2 (Oct. 1973), p. 125.

and some studies have reported that women principals have been found to perform better than men in several important dimensions (e.g., they are more ready to exchange information, and teachers and superiors tended to prefer women principals;[1] they work more hours and are more inclined to be innovative;[2] and they are more often democratic leaders[3,4]).

Recently there has been increased interest by women in school administration as a career. Officials of several university administrator training programs reported that the percentage of women students in their programs has dramatically increased. In 1975-76, 49 percent of all administrative services certificates were issued to women.[5]

Conclusions

1. The percentage of principals who are women has declined from 15 percent in 1970-71 to 11.4 percent in 1975-76.

1. Glen Stice, Norman Frederikson, John K. Hemphill and Daniel Griffiths, Criteria of Performance on School Administration. Research Memorandum 60-17. (Princeton, New Jersey: Educational Testing Service, 1960), pp. 60-

2. Preble, op. cit.

3. Hulda Grobman and Vynce Hines, "What Makes a Good Principal?" Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, Vol. 31, No. 2, (Nov. 1956), pp. 5-16. Quoted in Patricia A. Schmuck, Wanted: More Women: Sex Differentiation in Public School Administration, (Arlington, VA: National Council of Administrative Women in Education, 1975).

4. Charlene T. Dale, "Women are Still Missing Persons in Administrative and Supervisory Jobs", Educational Leadership, Vol. 31, No. 2 (Nov. 1973), pp. 123-127.

5. Memo, Commission on Teacher Preparation and Licensing to Joint Legislative Budget Committee, September 12, 1977. Data for other years are not available.

2. The decline in the number of women principals does not stem from an unavailability of candidates (a) who are credentialed or (b) who are employed in lower-level administrative positions.

Recommendation

We recommend that the Department of Education investigate the reasons behind the modest representation of women in principalships and report its findings and recommendations to the Legislature by June 1, 1978.

C. ETHNICITY

In California, the number of minority principals has increased in recent years. Table 2 compares data from 1967 and 1973. As may be seen, the proportion of principals who are minority group members increased markedly in the interval.

Table 2
Number and Percentage of Principals
From Various Ethnic Groups Who Were Employed
In the California Public Schools, 1967 and 1973[a]

Ethnicity	Percent of Teachers 1973	Principals 1967 Number	1967 Percent	1973 Number	1973 Percent	Change from 1967 Number	Change from 1967 Percent
American Indian	0.2	16	0.17%	60	.58%	44	+275%
Asian American	2.7	39	0.41	113	1.09	74	+90
Black	5.3	170	1.79	551	5.33	381	+224
Spanish Surname	3.4	170	1.79	413	4.00	243	+143
Other Non-White	---	12	0.12	0	0	-12	---
Anglo	88.4	9,100	95.72	9,194	89.00	94	+1
Total	100.0%	9,507	100.0%	10,331	100.00%	824	8.7%

a. Source: Ruben Espinosa and Joseph Garcia, Credentialed Staff-Pupil Ratios by Ethnicity in the California Public Schools. (San Diego: California School Finance Reform Project, California State University, 1976), p. 5. Data from 1967 and 1973 Racial-Ethnic Surveys.

Overall, in this period the number of minority group members employed as school principals increased from 407 to 1,137 or by 179 percent. By 1973, 11 percent of all principals were minority group members. (A similar proportion of teachers are members of minority groups. Overall, in 1973, 11.6 percent of all teachers -- 20,980 out of 180,213 -- were minority group members.)[1]

Data regarding minority participation in educational administration is not available after the 1973-74 year. However, data regarding credentialed staff from four large school districts suggest that the trend toward increased participation by minority group members is continuing.[2] Statewide data will be collected by the department this fall in the Racial-Ethnic Survey funded by Section 71 of Chapter 895, Statutes of 1977 (AB 65).

Conclusion

A substantial increase in the percentage of principals who are minority group members took place between 1967 and 1973. The percentage of principals who are minority group members was approximately the same as the percentage who were teachers in 1973. More recent data will be collected this fall pursuant to Chapter 895, Statutes of 1977 (AB 65).

D. SALARY

Salaries for principals are set by school districts. In 1975-76, the median salary of elementary principals was $24,249 and secondary principals, $26,784.[3]

1. Ruben Espinosa and Joseph Garcia, Credentialed Staff-Pupil Ratios by Ethnicity in the California Public Schools (San Diego: California School Finance Reform Project, California State University, 1976). p. 5.

2. Ibid, p. 13.

3. Bureau of School Apportionments and Reports, California State Department of Education, Salaries of Certificated Employees in California Public Schools, 1975-76, op. cit.

E. TURNOVER

Although reliable statistics on the length of service for school principals are not available for the state, some information is available. Data regarding turnover of school site administrators (e.g., principals, vice-principals, deans, etc.) collected by the Association of California School Administrators is presented in Table 4.

Table 4
Number of Years Administrators Have
Held Current Positions
May, 1977 [a]

Number of Years	Elementary	Intermediate/ Junior High	High School
1-3	24%	33%	29%
4-6	17	24	31
7-12	28	29	31
over 12	1	14	9
Total	100%	100%	100%

a. Data based on 1,107 responses to a member survey conducted by the Association of California School Administrators, Burlingame, California.

These data show that 24-33 percent of school site administrators reported being in their present positions three years or less; 17-31 percent for four to six years; approximately 30 percent for seven to 12 years; and 10-30 percent over 12 years. The data are for current assignment only, and do not include experience in other assignments.

Caution must be exercised in interpreting the data because only a small portion of the administrators responded to the survey. However, if

these statistics are representative of the state as a whole, and if turnover rates are uniform over time, as many as 20-25 percent of all school level administrators[1,2,3] are placed in new assignments annually.

Conclusion

Limited available data suggest that there may be substantial turnover among principals. Inasmuch as adequate turnover data are not currently available on a statewide basis, and because stability in the principalship may be important (see Section I), data should be collected and analyzed.

Recommendation

We recommend that the Department of Education collect and report to the Legislature (on a one-time basis) statistics regarding turnover rates for public school administrators together with reasons for turnover.

1. In our small sample of principals, six of 28 -- 21 percent -- were newly assigned or hired this fall.

2. Information from a 1968 national survey of elementary principals (not all elementary site administrators), if extended over a period of years, reveals that approximately 17 percent are hired annually into the principalship. (National Education Association, The Elementary School Principalship in 1968, (Washington, D.C., NEA, 1968).)

3. Similar data from a 1975 survey of Orange County elementary principals indicates that approximately 17 percent may be hired annually. (Kenneth J. Preble, Elementary Principals in Orange County (Fullerton: California State University), Preliminary Draft.)

III. PRE-SERVICE TRAINING AND CREDENTIALING OF PRINCIPALS

This section describes training and credential requirements for school principals. It should be noted that the pre-service training of principals is controlled indirectly by licensing requirements, because all principals are required to have administrative services credentials.

A. RESEARCH ON THE ADEQUACY OF PRE-SERVICE TRAINING

Research generally indicates there is a poor relationship between the amount of pre-service training and on-the-job performance. This research is derived partly from academic transcripts and does not include measures of course quality. We know of no studies which relate course quality to the quality of job performance.[1,2]

Recently, universities have begun to experiment with role-playing, simulations and other techniques in an effort to make administrator training more relevant. In addition, at least one course during which students

1. John K. Hemphill, Daniel E. Griffiths, and Norman Frederiksen, Administrative Performance and Personality (New York: Teachers College Columbia University, 1962); Kenneth J. Preble, Jr., Success in Administration: The Judges and the Judged, Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation (Department of Education, The University of Chicago, 1962), James M. Lipham, "The Personal Variables of Effective Administrators," Administrator's Notebook, Vol. 9, No. 1 (September, 1960); William C. Schutz, Procedures for Identifying Persons with Potential for Public School Positions (Berkeley: University of California, Cooperative Research Project No. 1076, 1966); Neal Gross and Robert E. Herriott, Staff Leadership in Public Schools (New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1965), and Donald A. Erickson, R. Jean Hills, and Norman Robinson, Educational Flexibility in an Urban School District (Vancouver, British Columbia Educational Research Institute of British Columbia 1970). Quoted in Edwin M. Bridges and Melany E. Baehr, "The Future of Administrator Selction Procedures," Administrator's Notebook, Vol. 19, No. 5 (January 1971).

2. See also Anita A. Summers and Barbara L. Wolfe, Equality of Educational Opportunity Quantified: A Production Function Approach (Philadelphia: Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia, Department of Research, 1974).

receive direct field experience is now part of all of California's preparation programs. However, it is apparent that training programs do not provide principals with some skills they need, perhaps because such skills are often "position-specific" (i.e., vary greatly from position to position).

One California study reported that both elementary and secondary principals rated their experience as principals, their teaching experience, and their teacher training as being more useful in their jobs than their administrator training.[1]

In addition, data provided by the Association of California School Administrators, together with interviews with district personnel, indicate that principals often feel they are not sufficiently trained to be school leaders. In addition, they sometimes feel inadequately trained to observe and evaluate classroom behavior.[2,3]

---

1. Paul Grippa, Testimony to the Assembly Permanent Subcommittee on Educational Reform, Interim Hearings on School Principals (San Diego, November 15, 1976). This study was conducted in the Bay Area.

2. A forthcoming study of school managers reports that only 22 percent of the principals felt pre-service programs helped them to recognize the possibilities of innovation by pre-service or in-service training programs. Regarding other areas of innovation, 13 percent of the principals interviewed reported that such training helped with planning but not implementation, while 66% reported that such training was insignificant or of no help. (Rodney J. Reed, School Principals: Leaders or Managers? (Berkeley, University of California, forthcoming)).

3. Association of California School Administrators, Professional Development Programs, 1976-77 Assessment Survey Summary. The entire list of needs is available from ACSA.

B. CURRENT TRAINING AND CREDENTIALING REQUIREMENTS

The Teacher Preparation and Licensing Law of 1970 (Chapter 557, Statutes of 1970, also known as the Ryan Act) established the Commission on Teacher Preparation and Licensing (CTPL). Under this law, responsibility for program accreditation and credentialing resides in the CTPL. Rather than the unit course requirements previously mandated, the Ryan Act requires programs at colleges and universities to be designed so that persons who complete them are competent in various areas. (A complete list of competencies is presented in Appendix A).

Requirements for the administrative services credential were set in 1973-74. They are:

(a) possession of a valid teaching or pupil personnel services credential;

(b) three years of successful full-time teaching experience, or three years of experience in the field of pupil personnel services; and

(c) satisfactory completion of either (1) a one-year internship in an approved program; (2) an approved program of "specialized and professional preparation" in administrative services; or (3) an examination in administrative services. Currently, the examination used is the administration portion of the National Teachers Examination.

Thus, prospective administrators have the option of passing a test or enrolling in an internship or regular preparation program at a university or college. We were informed that administrative services credential programs approved under the Ryan Act require from 21 to 60 quarter units of work.

After the Ryan Act became law, many educators expected that a new examination would be created which would be capable of evaluating an individual's ability to administer programs. However, because it does not have funding to develop a new examination, the Commission has utilized the administration portion of the National Teachers Examination.

Partly in response to perceptions that the National Teachers Examination was inadequate, in 1977 the Legislature passed SB 87 (Rodda), which eliminated passing this test as one way to meet part of the administrator services credential requirements. However, this bill was vetoed by the Governor.

C. GUIDELINES FOR ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES CREDENTIAL PREPARATION PROGRAMS

The CTPL has prepared guidelines for institutions to follow in preparing programs for both the administrative services credential and the administrative internship. The requirements are broad-scoped and are intended to provide flexibility for shifting program demands in response to changing needs and technology. (For example, one reads, "Acquire a working knowledge of movements and trends in curriculum.")

Guidelines for both the administrative services programs and the administrative services internship programs require that institutions provide opportunities for students to develop competencies in (a) education program improvement; (b) personnel management; (c) administrative leadership; (d) school-community relations; (e) governance and legal processes; and (f) principles and practices of public school management.[1]

---

1. Commission for Teacher Preparation and Licensing, "Professional Preparation Guidelines for the Administrative Services Credential" and Professional Preparation Guidelines for the Administrative Services Internship Credential." (Sacramento: the Commission, 1973 and 1974 respectively).

It should be noted that although participating institutions must provide an opportunity for potential administrators to acquire these competencies, they are not typically required to master them all.

Conclusions

1. All school administrators are licensed by a single credential.

2. Training programs for school administrators are broad-scoped. It would be difficult to make requirements more precise because they are designed for persons who are to serve in supervisory positions not only at the school site but in the district office.

D. NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS OFFERING PROGRAMS AND NUMBER OF CREDENTIALS ISSUED

Currently, four University of California campuses, 16 California State University and Colleges campuses and 17 private schools offer administrative preparation programs.[1]

The number of administrative services credentials issued annually is presented in Table 3. In 1976-77, 10,428 credentials were issued. Because there are only approximately 14,400 FTE administrative positions in California,[2] many more administrators are being licensed that can be employed.

1. California Commission for Teacher Preparation and Licensing, Directory of Approved Programs in California Colleges and Universities. . . (Sacramento, The Commission, 1977).

2. Bureau of School Apportionments and Reports, California State Department of Education, 1975-76 California Public Schools Selected Statistics (Sacramento: The Department, 1977). p. 12

Table 3

Administrative Services Credentials Issued by the Commission for Teacher Preparation and Licensing

Year	Number
1973-74	11,427
1974-75	9,808
1975-76 (10 months only)	5,478
1976-77	10,428

The CTPL provided us with a breakdown of the basis upon which credentials are being issued as shown in Table 4. As is readily apparent, the basis upon which a substantial number of credentials were issued is unknown.[1]

Table 4

Administrative Services Credentials Issued, 1976-77[a]

Requirement	1975-76 (10 months) Number	1975-76 (10 months) Percent	1976-77 Number	1976-77 Percent
By Institutional Recommendation	525[b]	10%	304	3%
Internship	0	0	120	1
Examination	1,024	19	7,044	68
Unexplained	3,929	71	2,960	28
Total	5,478	100%	10,428	100%

a. Source: Memo from Commission on Teacher Preparation and Licensing to Joint Legislative Budget Committee, September 12, 1977.

b. Includes internships.

1. The Commission reported several reasons for this. Some of the credentials issued (1,328) were for coursework begun under the previous licensing law; the Fisher Act (Chapter 57, Statutes of 1961); 455 Fisher Act credentials were issued last year; and the 7,044 credentials granted by examination were for a different time interval. However, the numbers cannot be reconciled even utilizing this data.

In 1976-77, 68 percent of all credentials were issued on the basis of the examination. This compares to 19 percent issued pursuant to this requirement in 1975-76. Thus, a substantial shift is occurring in the basis for credentialing school administrators.

The CTPL recently raised the qualifying score on the examination in an effort to tighten up credentialing requirements. For this reason the proportion of persons receiving administrative services credentials through the examination may decline in the future.

Conclusions

1. Since persons have been able to obtain administrative services credentials via the examination process, a substantial shift has taken place in the means by which administrators are licensed. In 1976-77, two-thirds of all administrators were licensed on the basis of a test. (This proportion may decline in the future because of a recent change in the qualifying score.)

2. The Commission for Teacher Preparation and Licensing has been unable to provide us with accurate data regarding the basis upon which administrator services credentials are issued.

3. The state is currently licensing more school administrators than are needed.

Recommendation

We recommend that the Commission for Teacher Preparation and Licensing include in its annual report breakdowns regarding the number of credentials granted according to the requirements mandated by law.

E. REVIEW AND EVALUATION OF CREDENTIALING PROGRAMS

Education Code, Section 44225, which enumerates the duties of the Commission for Teacher Preparation and Licensing, mandates an evaluative function as follows:

> "(j) to monitor and evaluate the results of its action as it relates to the performance of teachers licensed under this article."

It should be noted that the legislation does not directly require that the Commission evaluate and monitor administrative services credential programs.

Two evaluations are conducted of administrator preparation programs First, institutions are required to conduct a survey of their graduates after they have left training programs. However, the CTPL does not systematically review the findings of these surveys.

Secondly, the CTPL monitors the operation of approved professional preparation programs at some institutions of higher education in California through its "External Assessment" program. Administrative services programs at six institutions were reviewed in the 1976-77 year, and the CTPL plans to review 14 in 1977-78. These evaluations are designed as part of the CTPL oversight to measure whether programs are operating according to the institution's own plan. No comparisons are made between programs at different institutions.

Our review suggests that adequate follow-up studies of graduates have not always been conducted by institutions. Furthermore, inasmuch as review of the quality of preparation programs for the administrative

services credential is conducted only by institutions, no comparisons are available to determine (a) the relative performance of persons licensed by the test, internship or regular programs; (b) whether some institutions have programs which are more effective than others; (c) whether Ryan Act programs are as effective as prior programs, or (d) whether CTPL guidelines are adequate for all training needs. Each of these comparisons is important.

Conclusions

1. Legislation explicitly requires that the Commission for Teacher Preparation and Licensing monitor and review the quality of teacher preparation programs. No mandate is stipulated regarding the evaluation of administrative services or other support services credentialing programs.

2. The overall quality of administrator preparation programs has not been assessed at the state level since the Ryan Act was implemented.

Recommendations

1. We recommend that Section 44225 of the Education Code be amended to require that the Commission for Teacher Preparation and Licensing monitor and evaluate the results of its action as it relates to the performance of all persons licensed by it.

2. We recommend that the Commission for Teacher Preparation and Licensing develop a plan to evaluate administrative services credential programs which (a) is designed to compare the quality of the performance of persons who have completed training programs licensed under (i) the regular preparation program, (ii) the internship, and (iii) the test; and (b) enables comparisons to be made between programs at different institutions.

IV. SELECTION AND EVALUATION OF PRINCIPALS

This section discusses research and current practice regarding selection and evaluation of principals.

A. SELECTION OF PRINCIPALS

In our interviews with principals, we asked about the administrator selection procedures used by districts. They informed us that larger districts generally have established a list of candidates from which administrative appointments are made. While specific details vary from district to district, the selection process usually involves:

(1) an initial paper screening of candidates;

(2) interviews by a screening committee composed of district personnel (often including teachers and aides and sometimes parents and community members) which recommends one or several candidates to the district office; and

(3) selection of the final candidate by the superintendent and ratification by the governing board.

Several principals whom we interviewed indicated that the procedures for filling vacancies in principalships varied from time to time, depending upon the board of superintendent. Their comments, together with other information, indicate that this variation may extend to other top administrative positions also. Procedures for moving selected principals from a 10-month to 12-month contract or in making transfers to other schools may also be unsystematic.

Conclusion

Administrative selection procedures used by school districts are not always based upon written guidelines. Similarly, transfer and promotion procedures for administrators may not be systematic.

B. RESEARCH ON THE SELECTION OF PRINCIPALS

It is often commented, in research as elsewhere, that the likelihood of being selected as a principal depends partly upon personal contacts with central office personnel or with other influential persons.[1] Part of the reason for this may be that a systematic, "foolproof" formula for selecting successful school principals has not been found. Neither letters of recommendation, interviews, nor rating scales have systematically been shown to be predictive of successful performance by principals. As one authority remarked, "no one device is dependable enough to use exclusively or thoughtlessly."[2]

Some pilot studies of the selection process have shown a relationship between some personality traits (such as "executive professional leadership", discussed in Section I, or verbal ability) and success in job performance. However, only a small correlation exists between tests and ratings of administrator performance.[3] This is partially because successful administrators have a number of different personality types, and schools have varying needs.

---

1. See, e.g., Donald P. Mitchell and Anne Hawley, Leadership in Public Education Study: A Look at the Overlooked (Washington, D.C.: Academy for Educational Development, Inc., 1972), p. 43.

2. Kenneth E. McIntyre, "The Way It Was/Is", National Elementary Principal, Vol. 53, No. 5 (July/August 1974), pp. 30-34.

3. John K. Hemphill, et. al., Administrative Performance and Personality (New York: Teachers College, Columbia, 1962), pp. 336-337.

Some research on selection processes is now emerging which may improve the basis for judging the quality of applicants for administrative positions. The American Telephone and Telegraph Company, in connection with the American Psychological Association and the National Association of Secondary School Principals, is field testing an assessment center approach to the selection of school administrators. Bell researchers have spent 20 years developing this program and have considerable confidence in its potential usefulness.[1,2,3]

At the same time, the RAND Corporation, continuing its research on federal projects supporting educational change, is identifying characteristics of principals which may be applicable to the selection process. This research should be available shortly.[4]

Conclusion

No systematic, reliable procedure has been developed for use in all situations for selecting principals. However, because of the variation in school needs, such a uniform approach may be inappropriate.

1. Joseph L. Moses, et. al., The Technical Assistance Program: A Review of the Public Policy and Social Issues Committee in Action. Report for distribution at the Division 14 Business Meeting, 84th Annual Convention of the American Psychological Assn. (Washington, D.C., Sept. 4, 1976).

2. The project is described more fully in the Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, Vol. 61, No. 410 (Sept. 1977).

3. Additional information is available in James R. Huck, "Assessment Centers: A Review of the External and Internal Validities", Personnel Psychology, Vol. 26, No. 2 (Summer 1973), pp. 191-212, and Ann Howard, "An Assessment of Assessment Centers", Academy of Management Journal, Vol. 17, No. 1 (March 1974), pp. 115-134.

4. Personal communication, Milbrey McLaughlin, RAND Corp., Sept. 14, 1977.

C. EVALUATION OF PRINCIPALS

As indicated in Section I, the Stull Act mandates a regular, written evaluation for principals as well as for other supervisory and administrative personnel. Evaluations are based upon established job responsibilities. Principals are subject to dismissal from district employment for incompetence or unprofessional conduct, as are teachers.[1]

Our survey revealed that virtually all principals are formally evaluated, either annually or every two years. Some California school principals are being demoted to lower positions,[2] which is possible because they have no real "tenure" as principals.[3]

Nonetheless, it appears that superintendents and boards are sometimes hesitant to remove principals. In its review of the district's operations, the San Francisco Public Schools Commission reported, for example, that it could find no instances where principals were demoted, either during their four year "contracts" or at the end of the contract periods.[4]

1. Education Code, Section 44662.

2. The Association of California School Administrators has received over 150 inquiries from administrators who were being demoted.

3. In one demotion case, the Court of Appeals upheld a school district's demotion even though the reason given by the district for reassigning the principal was irrelevant. The Court ruled "... except when the reason is one that impinges upon constitutional rights any reason, no matter how trivial, is sufficient." (Grant v. Adams, (69 C.A. 3d 127)).

4. San Francisco Public Schools Commission, Report and Recommendations on the Role of Principals in San Francisco's Public Schools (San Francisco, The Commission, 1976).

Conclusion

Regular principal evaluations based on written criteria are required in the Stull Act. These evaluations are conducted by district central office personnel.

D. RESEARCH ON THE EVALUATION OF PRINCIPALS

One national authority remarked, "There is no viable, systematic rationale for the elementary school principalship to determine expectations for performance; no criteria exists through which performance can be measured."[1] While this remark somewhat overstates the case (as Section I indicated), it is true that available evaluative instruments and technology do not permit a systematic measurement of principal performance. In this light, evaluation, like selection, cannot be mechanical.

While systematic evaluation mechanisms may be nonexistent, research on administrator evaluation is abundant.[2] However, there appears to be little consensus on what the content or process of the evaluation should be.

Principals may even be unaware of the basis for evaluation. One California study revealed that principals did not know what criteria were used in evaluating their administrative performance. It also pointed out that methods for collecting evaluative data were often mixed with the

1. Keith Goldhammer, Elementary School Principals and Their Schools: Beacons of Brilliance and Potholes of Pestilence (Eugene, Oregon: Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, 1971), p. 4

2. See, e.g., Gary Natriello, et. al., A Summary of the Recent Literature on the Evaluation of Principals, Teachers and Students. (Stanford: Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching, 1977).

criteria (such as the "grapevine", "general impressions", "phone calls") and concluded that the principals in the study were universally dissatisfied with the system.[1]

Research we reviewed suggests a number of changes should be considered by districts in the process used to evaluate school administrators.

1. The quality of a school principal is primarily related to his or her impact on the school. When principals are evaluated, the entire condition of the school itself should be considered along with other assessments of the quality of the principal.[2,3]

2. Inasmuch as the evidence is fairly clear on the relationships between teacher perceptions of principal support and school quality, teacher statements regarding principal support should be included as part of the evaluation of principals conducted by the central office. Where possible, parents and students should also play a part in evaluation. (This suggestion is not intended to mean that teacher, parent and student perceptions should necessarily be taken literally. Very often mitigating circumstances may influence the teacher perceptions of the performance of school principals, particularly in "difficult" schools. However, because these perceptions are important in assessing overall school quality, they should be considered during principal evaluations.)

---

1. Terrence E. Deal, Sanford M. Dornbusch and Robert A. Crawford, Evaluating Principals-Applying a Theory of Evaluation (Stanford: School of Education, 1976).

2. Bruce R. Joyce describes school reform in holistic terms in "Structural Imagination and Professional Staff Development", in David D. Marsh, ed., Conference on Leadership in In-Service Education (Los Angeles, School of Education, University of Southern California and the California Network for Staff Development, 1976).

3. See also Michael Scriven, A Procedure for Assessing the Performance of a Particular School. A report to the San Francisco Public Schools Commission, December, 1976.

3. Consideration should be given to trying a system in which principals evaluate each other. Such a system would involve collection of evaluation data during structured visits. This process would not only provide a framework for the evaluative process but would also enable principals to observe each other perform.[1]

1. This suggestion comes from Deal, Dornbusch and Crawford, op. cit.

V. IN-SERVICE TRAINING PROGRAMS FOR PRINCIPALS

This section evaluates the need for in-service programs, describes existing programs, presents evidence available regarding the effectiveness of currently operating programs, and makes recommendations regarding in-service opportunities for principals.

A. NEED FOR PROGRAMS

As indicated in Section I, many new demands have been thrust upon school principals in the last decade.[1] At the same time, pre-service programs are often inadequate to prepare principals fully because they are designed to train all school supervisory personnel, and opportunities for "hands on" experience are limited. In addition, "renewal" programs are often advisable for principals who need to upgrade their skills or are experiencing particular problems. Therefore, additional training programs are needed for nearly all administrative personnel.

B. CURRENT IN-SERVICE TRAINING OPPORTUNITIES

Principals whom we interviewed indicated a range of attitudes about their in-service opportunities. Some declared that no matter how many opportunities they had, they might never catch up with new demands made on them. Generally, the principals indicated that they had sufficient in-service opportunities, although they could not always afford the time to take advantage of them. We asked how many had access to in-service programs designed specifically for school site administrators. The results are detailed in Table 5.

---

1. See also Seymour B. Sarason, The Culture of the School and the Problem of Change (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1971), p. 130.

Table 5
In-Service Opportunities for School Principals
September, 1977[a]

Question	Yes	No
1. Since becoming a school site administrator, have you participated in any extended program for school site administrators?	79%	21%
2. Was there a program designed explicitly for new school site administrators in your district this year?	36%	64%
3. Does your district have a formal program for principals who are having a difficult time?	14%	86%

a. Source: Interviews with a sample of 28 elementary, junior high and high school principals.

Seventy-nine percent said they had participated in a long-term program for school site administrators. Many of these said the programs in which they had participated were sponsored by their school districts. Some, particularly those from small districts, had participated in county- or ACSA-sponsored programs.

Only 36 percent of the principals said there was a program for new school site administrators in their districts this year. (The small size of this statistic is due in part to the fact that some districts hired no new administrators this year.)

Only a small portion (14 percent) of the principals whom we interviewed said their districts had formal programs for administrators whose skills needed improvement. However, many respondents said that ad-hoc support was provided as needed. Furthermore, formal programs are most

needed in larger districts. For this reason, the absence of currently operating formal programs is not necessarily an indication of inadequate program development.

Our review suggests that many programs currently exist through which in-service training for school principals are available, including the following.

1. In-service training associated with categorical programs. Categorical programs (including Early Childhood Education (ECE), Educationally Disadvantaged Youth (EDY), Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Title I (ESEA, Title I), and state bilingual) are required to have in-service training components. In 1977-78 approximately 3,700 of California's 7,000 schools will have one or more of these programs. All staff, including principals, participate in such programs, however, information is not available regarding the number of actual participants, the number of hours spent in programs, or the extent of program expenditures for in-service training.

2. University programs. Administrators, like teachers, are paid partly according to degrees and credit units earned. Typically, school districts do not control which courses are taken. Furthermore, most research shows that such units are unrelated to job performance, and the costs to school districts for salary differentials are substantial. (In one study the NEA estimated that the differences in salary between a Bachelors' and Masters' degree for all school personnel involved $844 million annually in the U.S. In California, the annual cost would have been approximately one-tenth of this amount.)[1]

1. National Education Association, Teacher Salary Study (Washington: The Association, 1969) p. 13, quoted in Donald P. Mitchell and Anne Hawley, Leadership in Public Education Study: A Look at the Overlooked (Washington, D.C.: Academy for Educational Development, Inc., 1972), p. 55.

3. Professional association activities. A substantial number of workshops and institutes for administrators are organized each year in California by professional associations. The most well-known are presented by the Association of California School Administrators (ACSA). Last year, ACSA presented over 250 conferences, regional activities and workshops for which the total attendance was over 27,000 persons.[1] The most intensive program is called Project Leadership, which extends over an entire year. It is individualized and involves site visitations of administrators by other professionals.

4. University-sponsored in-service programs. Guidelines adopted by the Commission for Teacher Preparation and Licensing require institutions of higher education operating administrative services credential programs to include a program of in-service training. Participating institutions provide field service as well as classroom opportunities.[2]

5. Local efforts. Several local school districts have set up their own staff development efforts. A few have programs developed specifically for administrators.

The Los Angeles Unified School District, for example, has an in-service training program for administrators. In 1973-74, approximately 3,500 supervisorial and managerial employees participated in an extended management

1. ACSA has about 11,500 members and there are about 14,000 administrators in California. The 27,000 total attendance figure includes many persons who attended multiple events. (Personal communication, Arthur Thayer, Association of California School Administrators, September 6, 1977.)

2. California Commission for Teacher Preparation and Licensing, Professional Preparation Guidelines for the Administrative Services Credential, Section 3.1.2.

or organizational development program. This year the district has expanded its program to include a year-long program for new site administrative personnel.[1]

Personnel in the Los Angeles staff development unit said that principals spend approximately 15 days per year in skill development.[2]

6. Professional Development and Program Improvement Centers (PDPIC's) Some programs are available only to selected districts. One of these, PDPIC's was established by the Professional Development and Program Improvement Act of 1968 (Chapter 1414, Statutes of 1968 (AB 920), amended by Chapter 1499, Statutes of 1974 (AB 4151)). Under this act, $689,000 is being allocated to 13 local projects serving 103 school districts in the 1977-78 year. Funds are allocated for projects in elementary schools having ESEA, Title I, EDY, Miller-Unruh or ECE programs.

7. AB 551 (Chapter 966, Statutes of 1977). In the 1977-78 session, the Legislature enacted Chapter 966, AB 551 (Hart) which provides funds for some school districts to establish consolidated staff development programs. Funds are also provided for school resource centers. Programs are required to include the school principal. Funding is to increase from $1,050,000 in 1977-78 to $3,500,000 in 1982-83 and thereafter.

8. Federal Teacher Centers. The Education Amendments of 1976 amends Title V of the Federal Education Professions Development Act to include Teacher Centers. Each teacher center program will be operated by at least

1. Staff Development Branch, Los Angeles Unified School District Factor Analysis Related to Pupil Integration (Los Angeles: Los Angeles Unified School District, 1977) mimeographed, p. 9.

2. Personal communication, Robert DeVries, August 29, 1977.

one local educational agency and will be designed to develop and improve curricula, teacher and principal skills. Teacher centers will be operated by policy boards, the majority of whose members are required to be teachers.

Funding for the teachers centers had not been authorized as of late September.

9. ESEA, Title IV-C. Beginning in the 1977-78 year, 13 pilot staff development projects are being funded at a cost of approximately $1.2 million from the federal ESEA, Title IV-C program. The overall purpose of these projects is to "develop, impelment and evaluate a comprehensive and ongoing system to promote, encourage and accomplish improved instruction through planned change." Some projects are oriented towards principal needs. Projects are funded for periods of one to three years.[1]

Although the above review indicates that many opportunities exist, reliable data are not available regarding the actual number of hours spent by school personnel nor the cost of in-service programs.

Conclusions

1. Opportunities currently exist for principals to acquire in-service training through (a) categorical programs, (b) universities, which, in addition to general courses, provide in-service opportunities designed specifically for practicing administrators, (c) professional associations, (d) the Professional Development and Program Improvement Centers, which provide programs in some districts for school personnel in elementary schools

1. Department of Education, "Specifications for the Critical Needs Category of Projects, ESEA, Title IV-C", (The Department, n.d.), Attachment 4.

with selected categorical programs, and (e) a number of locally funded efforts. Additional funds for in-service opportunities will be available through AB 551 and the federal teacher center program.

2. The Professional Development and Program Improvement Centers (PDPIC's) are restricted by statute to elementary schools having certain categorical programs. Inasmuch as the regulations which apply to most of these categorical programs require staff development components for all participants (including principals), restricting PDPIC's to elementary schools is no longer necessary. By eliminating this restriction, funds could be redirected to secondary schools.

Recommendation

We recommend legislation to extend the Professional Development and Program Improvement Centers to secondary schools.

C. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION AND STATE BOARD PARTICIPATION

The State Board of Education recently established a policy regarding staff development in California public schools. It states that staff development for all school personnel, including administrators, is requisite for the improvement of education. Subsequently, the Department of Education has established an Office of Staff Development. The office will coordinate the AB 551, PDPIC, and Teacher Centers efforts as well as develop and disseminate effective staff development techniques.

D. RESEARCH CONCERNING IN-SERVICE PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS

While there are abundant opportunities for training, information about the effectiveness of in-service programs is sketchy. Generally, evaluative information, when collected at all, has been limited to questionnaires.

Evidence does exist that some in-service programs appear to result in improved outcomes. For example:

(1) data from the PDPIC evaluations shows that student scores in some districts are higher when they are taught by teachers who have been through PDPIC programs;[1]

(2) one Emergency School Aid Act program involving principal in-service training (among many other variables) produced a rather pronounced decline in the number of student suspensions in junior high schools, as well as other benefits;[2]

(3) a project to install programs for handicapped children in schools involving substantial in-service training and a pivotal role for principals appears to have produced (a) a 50 percent reduction in the number of pupils who had to be removed from class, (b) improved performance in reading, over three years, for both normal and handicapped pupils, and (c) improved ratings of job satisfaction and interpersonal relations for teachers, principals, and pupils over the same period;[3] and

1. California State Department of Education, Summary Report for the Professional Development and Program Improvement Centers Program for 1975-76. (Sacramento, 1977). This evidence should be accepted cautiously since it does not result from rigorous estimating procedures.

2. Vallejo City Unified School District, R^4: Reading, Riting, Rithmetic, Race Relations to Improve Academic Achievement and Human Relations. A Title VII, ESAA Proposal (Vallejo, VCUSD, 1976).

3. Keith E. Beery, Project Catalyst: Final Program Performance Report (San Rafael: Institute for Independent Educational Research, 1976).

(4) a study of increasing and decreasing levels of student performance in low socioeconomic status schools identified in-service programs as one of the differences between high and low achieving schools.[1]

On the other hand, we have seen no evidence that programs implemented on a statewide basis result in improved student performance.[2,3] (Part of the reason for a lack of evidence is that implementation and evaluation strategies were not designed to reveal such information.)

Evidence regarding the effectiveness of in-service training programs will be emerging in the near future. Chapter 894, Statutes of 1977 (AB 65) and Chapter 966, Statutes of 1977 (AB 551) requires that evaluations be conducted by the Department of Education as well as by an independent evaluator of the effectiveness of school improvement programs, including staff development components. The Superintendent of Public Instruction is required to disseminate the effective practices which have been identified.

Conclusion

Although evidence exists that some in-service training programs are successful in achieving desired outcomes, evaluative information is inadequate to describe (a) the settings in which successful programs are likely to result or (b) formats of effective programs.

1. California State Department of Education, Interim Report on the Special Study of Selected ECE Schools with Increasing and Decreasing Reading Scores (Sacramento: The Department, 1977), pp. 22-25.

2. California State Department of Education, Evaluation Report of ECE, ESEA Title I, and EDY, 1975-76 (Sacramento, The Department, 1977).

3. Eva L. Baker, et. al., Evaluation of the California Early Childhood Education Program: Executive Summary (Los Angeles: Center for the Study of Evaluation, UCLA, 1977).

VI. UNFINISHED TASKS

The first five sections of this report contain recommendations which can be implemented in the coming months. However, a great deal of work is necessary over several years in order to improve the pre- and in-service training of principals.

At least three major tasks remain.

1. Adequate information is not currently available regarding the quality of pre-service training of administrators. We are uncertain, for example, whether it would be appropriate for specific emphases to be offered in pre-service programs for school site and central office personnel. Nor do we have any systemwide data which evaluates the performance of persons trained and licensed under the Ryan Act. These questions cannot be answered without thorough evaluation of the performance of college and university programs. We have recommended that the Commission for Teacher Preparation and Licensing prepare a plan for evaluating administrative services credential programs and that legislation be enacted to require an evaluation. After the plan is approved and implemented, adequate answers to the above questions will be available. Policy changes should be based on those findings.

2. Section IV shows that no systematic methodologies are currently available for the selection of principals. However, improvements in selection procedures may be possible following field testing of Assessment Centers. In two or three years, after adequate field testing has taken

place, the Legislature may wish to sponsor a pilot project for the selection and evaluation of school administrators.

3. Section V reviews current opportunities for in-service training. However, evaluation designs are inadequate for assessing overall program effectiveness or for describing particularly effective strategies. After designs for evaluating program effectiveness have been developed and implemented, it may be necessary to revise laws relating to in-service training for school principals and other personnel.

APPENDIX

PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCY REQUIREMENTS FOR
THE ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES CREDENTIAL PREPARATION PROGRAMS

Candidates should have opportunities to develop the following competencies:

2.1.1 Effect improvement in the educational program.

- Acquire a working knowledge of movements and trends in curriculum.
- Comprehend newer developments in teaching procedures, content in subject fields.
- Survey knowledge of philosophies and history of public education.
- Understand organizational patterns of the public schools.
- Develop attitudes, skills and techniques leading to proficiency in effecting improvement.
- Identify and study the social, political, and economic forces affecting education, and to develop techniques for using these forces.

2.1.2 Develop an understanding of sound personnel management.

- Acquire a working knowledge of selection procedures and supervision and evaluation techniques.
- Acquire an understanding of current public school employer-employee relations (Winton Act, collective bargaining, CEC panels, etc.)
- Develop skill in handling personnel problems, basing decisions on sound principles of personnel administration.

2.1.3 Develop skill and understanding in use of effective techniques in administrative leadership.

- Understand human motivation and group dynamics.
- Achieve proficiency in oral and written communication. Practical experience should be provided to develop policy positions, argumentation, and opinion in both oral and written form.
- Develop competency in handling conflict situations and dealing with controversial issues.

2.1.4 Develop skill and understanding of school-community relations.

- Interpret interaction with community forces, particularly with school boards, community groups and leaders.
- Utilize the contributions of all concerned persons and groups in development of policy.
- Be able to work effectively with ethnic groups.
- Possess competency in decisionmaking based on factual data.
- Understand relations with news media and political agencies.

2.1.5 Achieve knowledge of governance and legal processes related to schools.

- Understand organizational patterns of public school governance.
- Know legal principles, statutes, and controlling case law and be proficient in application to decisions and actions.
- Have knowledge of laws related to youth conduct, contracts, liability and tort.
- Know recent federal and state laws and court cases affecting public education.

2.1.6 Acquire a foundational understanding of the principles and practices of public school management.

- Establish skills in all aspects of planning to include practice in task analysis, the setting of goals and objectives, and implementing of plans related to goals.
- Develop skill in relating educational programs to cost factors and applying sound financial procedures.
- Achieve an understanding of research and development techniques and skills by participating in research and development projects.
- Develop skills and knowledge concerning use of management tools.
- Achieve proficiency in evaluation techniques related to a school organization.
- Acquire an understanding of sound public school budget procedures including program budgeting.